

What is his business but to make drunkards, which cold water men have to support? But the time is coming when this great injustice will not be tolerated in this free country.

ANONYMOUS. The Literary and Theological Review has adopted the excellent rule of having the writers give their names. But in the last No. there is a deviation. The review of Finney's Lectures is anonymous. And those who read the article will not wonder. Read a sentence:

"We do not feel disposed to apply the rules of a rigorous morality to some of the artifices of the book; and it is openly as he stands connected with new measures, and takes the lead in the prevalent system of disorganization, that we have felt permitted to allude to his character at all. We say we do not know how much guilt may attach to these artifices, though we can see much mischief as the result. The truth is, Mr F. is now aware that he has pushed on too far; advance and retreat are both alike difficult. He is conscious that the public confidence is now fast ebbing away from him; and both charity and humanity forbid that we attach a responsibility to his convulsive flouncing which could belong only to deliberate motion."

Three facts—that 2500 persons subscribed for the New York Evangelist while these lectures were publishing—that ten or twelve thousand copies of the same lectures have been sold since they were published in a volume—and that Mr Finney has since been appointed by the trustees of the Western Reserve College, to a theological professorship in that institution, with nearly the unanimous consent of the ministers on the Reserve—may show how well this reviewer is qualified to judge of the standing of ministers whom he undertakes to revile as transgressors of the rules of morality. He did wisely in concealing his name.—*New York Evangelist.*

COMMUNICATIONS.

"BAPTIST GENERAL TRACT SOCIETY AND THE SLAVERY QUESTION."

As we design to give both sides an impartial hearing, we now give below the correspondence between certain Georgians and brother Allen—as formerly adverted to in the Telegraph—which appeared in the November number of the Tract Magazine, the monthly organ of the Baptist General Tract Society.

Brother Colver has very ably, clearly, and pointedly exposed brother Allen's duplicity and sycophancy. We do not precisely agree with him in regard to the duty of the Board, as our brief notes indicate.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER TO THE GENERAL AGENT.

Greenwood, Lincoln Co. Ga.,
25th Sept. 1835.

Brother J. M. Allen.—To our great surprise, there has been recently sent to our address, through the public mail, an incendiary abolition paper, called "Human Rights," published in the city of N. York, and circulated by the American Anti-Slavery Society of that State.

Our feelings, dear brother, have been greatly mortified and afflicted; and we are extremely sorry to say that our suspicions have fallen upon you as the cause of these papers being sent us, and we feel it a duty we owe you, as well as ourselves, to inquire whether you have had any agency in causing that publication to be sent us? Our suspicion has been excited from the fact, that none other than ourselves in this vicinity have received them, and that we are the only individuals in the neighborhood who subscribed for the Baptist (Tract) Magazine; and our names not being on any other subscription list at the north, or in any other way known to the northern fanatics, who would involve the south in scenes of blood and carnage to gratify a morbid philanthropy, which would cause the truly philanthropic soul to weep, and the patriot to mourn. We think an explanation from you is due, not only to us, but on account of the Institution for which you are engaged; as it is to be apprehended the cause may suffer materially in consequence of the measure of which we complain.

We have felt, and still feel a lively interest in the Institution for which you are Agent, and would be sorry that any circumstance should transpire to retard its beneficent operations; but, sir, we can never consent to patronize any institution, whose officers will connect with it, openly or covertly, measures calculating or tending to our country's ruin, or the misery of any portion of her population.

In conclusion, we ask you, dear brother, (we ask you seriously,) whether you have furnished the abolition agents with our names, or given them access to your subscription list with a knowledge of the design to forward those incendiary publications to our patrons? We hope you may be able to give a satisfactory answer to our inquiry, and if you please a communication through the Christian Index would be gratifying to us, as it would remove any prejudice that may have been imbibed by any of our fellow citizens in consequence of those papers being sent us.

In bonds of a loving gospel we subscribe ourselves your brethren in Christ.
BENJAMIN BENTLEY,
ANNE WELLBORN.

REPLY.

Philadelphia, October 28th, 1835.
Dear Brethren.—Your complaint is not the first of the kind which has reach-

ed me from friends in the south; and although I have more than once replied to these complaints through the public prints, in a manner that should be satisfactory to every candid person, yet, presuming you have not seen my communications on the subject, I feel that justice to the Society, as well as to yourselves and others, requires me to answer your inquiries and give you an explanation.

Although I am in principle opposed to slavery, yet I have not, and never had any fellowship with the measures of the abolitionists, believing that they are interfering in an unjustifiable manner with the rights of the south. I have never designedly in any way, either directly or indirectly, openly or covertly, aided the cause of the abolitionists. I have never sent any anti-slavery paper to any person in the world. And I have full confidence in those employed in the Depository during my absence from home, to believe that no anti-slavery publication was ever sent from the office by them, or through their agency. We have never furnished the abolition agents with your names, nor have we ever given them access to the list of our patrons and subscribers. No member of the Board, I am confident, has had any agency in sending anti-slavery publications to our friends in the south; and no member of the Board, to my knowledge, is friendly to the abolitionists.

When the Disclaimer of the Board was published in the Christian Index, September 23, 1834, I was wholly ignorant of the fact, which has since come to the knowledge of the Board, that one of our travelling agents on his return from the south in the early part of 1833, so far yielded to the solicitations of some abolitionists in the city of New York, as to give them the address of several individuals in the south, and yours probably among them. But as this was done without the knowledge of the Board, and is an act which we regard with feelings of deep regret and entire disapprobation, we trust the Society will continue to receive the confidence and patronage of its friends throughout the land.

Believing, dear brethren, that the above explanation will be perfectly satisfactory to you, permit me to commend this Institution to your prayers, and to the increased and untiring efforts of those who love the Savior and desire the spread of his truth.

Yours affectionately in the patience and kingdom of Jesus Christ.

J. M. ALLEN.

DEAR BROTHER MURRAY:

I perceive by the perusal of a communication from brother Case, in the last Telegraph, that the Baptists in Vermont feel themselves injured by the resolutions of the Board of the Baptist General Tract Society, and the accompanying letter of J. M. Allen their agent. And I must confess that I have felt the same with them. But permit me through your columns to intreat that no hasty measures may be adopted which may jeopardize the interest of the Tract Society. It is a cause that should lie near our hearts, as it is one with which no doubt the immortal destinies of thousands are concerned. It seems to me that this is a case which calls for the exercise of christian forbearance and kindness. It should be remembered that our Board occupy a critical and unenviable, as well as responsible station, having both the north and the south to regard in this matter. (1.) I can well appreciate their motive for wishing to keep the Tract operations disconnected from the question of slavery. And as yet I am compelled to justify them in their resolution to do so, even to the requiring of their agent to abstain from all interference with it, (notwithstanding brother Case condemns this feature of their doings.) It does seem to me that brethren should be willing that the Tract Society should not be trammelled in its operations by connecting with it a question which involves not only the liberty of the slaves but the liberty of our whole country. While this question is marshalling its mighty hosts, sustained and invigorated on the one side by philanthropy and justice, and love, and God, and on the other by tyranny, pride, cupidity and lust; and while the moral elements are shaken with the conflict, why not let the unassuming and single purposed Tract Society go on undisturbed in its own benevolent work of carrying its instructions to the ignorant, its Christ to the destitute and its consolations to the afflicted? (2.)

I am not disposed to apologise for any wrong that may have been done, nor to stay the hand of kind rebuke. If either the Board or their agent have erred in this matter, let kind remonstrance seek to put it right; but never let a thought of abandoning the Tract Society be indulged for a moment. (3.) Let not the union of the north and the south in this benevolent and single purpose be disturbed.

I must say further that the wrong in this case seems mainly in the agent, and not in the Board. All I can find in my heart to blame the Board for is, not strictly keeping to their purpose of neutrality. In this I confess I think they have erred. When they had decreed neutrality, and that their agent should in no way interfere with the question of slavery, it would have been expected that instead of sanctioning and giving a place in the Tract Magazine to that unwise and meddling letter of brother Allen's, they would have rebuked him as they did the agent, who (according to their understanding) had meddled on the other side of the question. But from a personal acquaintance with the members of the Board, and a knowledge of their moral worth, I cannot for a moment indulge a suspicion that there was any intention of departing from the standard of neutrality which they had set up. Feeling at the time the pressure

of danger from one side only, it was quite natural that the opposite should escape their vigilance. But do not let us imitate the morbid sensitiveness of the south, nor seek to drive them (as our Board) to our side of the question, and so endanger a cause which needs, (and can have if a proper spirit be maintained,) the prayers and efforts of both the north and the south.

It seems to me however that the letter of brother Allen deserves not only the condemnation of the Board, but of every christian, both at the north and the south, who believe with him that slavery is a sin, and who claim the right to proclaim it such, and to seek its removal by the force of truth. Who has read that letter and not felt his heart sickened at its manifest sycophancy and injustice? It would have been enough for him solemnly as agent, to announce to the south his neutrality, to which all would have responded, Amen. But what right had he to lay upon the altar of southern petulance the rights of his brethren of the north? What cruel injustice to charge the great body of his northern brethren with an unjustifiable interference with the rights of the south—a charge as false as it is unkind. Such a charge is unkind every way—to the abolitionists, because it is a false imputation of crime—to the south because it deceives them in this matter. Much of the irritation of the south is to be attributed to this and kindred assertions, loosely made, by those who are in more haste to please the oppressor, than to plead the cause of the oppressed. It is by just such gratuitous assertions that our brethren of the south are made to count us their enemy, because we would tell them the truth.

Abolitionists interfere with the rights of the south? What rights? Where? When? How? A charge so grave as this, and made on so grave an occasion, and jeopardizing so dear an interest; a charge too on which he was about to proclaim his non-fellowship with the great body of his brethren of the north, should have been accompanied with specifications, and sustained by proof; but either he cannot give. I confess I am at a loss to find either motive or apology, for so reckless and unkind a charge.

I ask again with what rights of the south are the abolitionists unjustly interfering? Have they ever sought to legislate for them? Never. Have they sought to endanger their domestic quiet, by addressing the slave? Never. Have they taught any other duty as devolving upon the slave but obedience to his master, not only to the gentle but even to the forward? Never. If they have, neither brother Allen, nor any of the disingenuous accusers of abolitionists, would be backward to specify it.

It is not the rights of the south with which the abolitionists are meddling but the wrongs, brother Allen himself being judge. Hear him: "I am opposed to slavery." Does he oppose a right? or a wrong? wrong of course. Agreed; so do abolitionists. Does he exercise the right to say that he is opposed to slavery? So do they. To write that he is opposed to slavery and send it to the south? So do they. (but not in the Tract Magazine.) What then is the difference between him and them? (for now he seems to be anti-slavery to all intents and purposes?) The difference is simply this, he lacks their honest consistency—they lack his servility. Nor will the south be backward to discern the true difference, or to hold such duplicity in utter abhorrence.

Let us put the sentiments of his letter into plain English, and see how it reads. "I am opposed to slavery;" that is, you of the south are doing wrong. The abolitionists are determined at all hazards to tell you of your wrong, and persuade you to repent; therefore I have no fellowship with them, but will uphold you in your wrong. I misunderstand him entirely if this is not fairly the sentiment of his letter. And really such a letter must be as offensive to the south, as to the north. No honorable man of the south can be pleased with such barefaced duplicity. I have too good an opinion of our slave-holding brethren generally, to suppose for a moment that they will admit the wrong, and yet be angry at the faithful remonstrance of their northern brethren. The fact is, they have not felt that slavery in the abstract is sin. "An object ever pressing dims the sight." They have slept over the sin of slavery just as other christians have slept over other sins that have come down to them from other generations. Familiarized to it from childhood, and having misapplied the scriptures on the subject, while they have eschewed many of its evils, they have not thought that slavery itself is sin. Let them but see that slavery at its root is sin, is guilt, is crime, and you may expect from them such action on the subject as becomes christians. They are now beginning to wake up.—The expostulations of the "few fanatics" of the north, have disturbed their slumbers. It is true they are a little petulant but what of that, it is nothing strange or discouraging. Children, you know, are apt to be peevish when partly awaked. But let them be fairly awaked and they will not be backward to fix a proper estimate of such lullaby productions as the letter upon which I am commenting, which have sought to prolong their slumbers in the midst of their sin, and over the volcano which threatens their destruction.

On the whole, sir, I must think that brother Allen has wrought folly in Israel. Let him be rebuked, repent and confess.—But in the mean time let us all cherish the precious cause of Tracts; and though we seek to correct his error let us here even his appeal for our prayers, our sympathies, and our aims. (4.)

NATH'L COLVER.
Greenwich, Jan. 12th, 1836.

(1.) No, Brother—neither the south, nor the north, but the commands of God.

(2.) Is it the duty of every christian to labor for the promotion of Temperance?

Yes. Is it the duty of every christian to labor for the abolition of slavery? Yes.

Is it the duty of all christians, at all times, to cast their influence against any and all manner of sin? Yes. How then can it be the duty of a certain body of christians to require one of their number to "abstain from all interference with" a certain species of sin?

(3.) It is not duty to abandon a Tract Society. And the Tract Society should be adhered to so long as it encourages no manner of sin. But if it makes use of our money and influence to sustain sin, it is time for us to remonstrate at least.—How can it be our duty to contribute money or influence, in support of sin?

(4.) This is sound doctrine. Just so far as the Board is implicated in sin, apply the same reasoning to them as to brother Allen—that's all.

We are sorry that the following was received twenty-four hours too late for our last number. It seems that our "conciliatory" brother "did not want" the Anti-Slavery anniversary held in his meeting-house! Furthermore, he refused, or at least neglected, to let the readers of the Telegraph have the notice of this meeting, in connexion with the notice which he gave of the others. Further still, the colonization papers of that county refused to give notice of the Anti-Slavery Society's meeting. Here is conciliation with a witness! "Why can't the two societies co-operate?" Is not the question abundantly answered by the conduct of those who ask it?

WASHINGTON COUNTY (N. Y.) ANTI-SLAVERY ANNIVERSARY.

Br. Murray:

I see by the last Telegraph, that Br. Baldwin, of our county, has requested you to notice the approaching anniversaries of the benevolent institutions in this county. Allow me to add, by way of supplement to Br. B's notice, that the Washington County Anti-Slavery Society will hold its anniversary on the same week and at the same place with the other anniversaries; to wit, on Thursday the 28th of January, at 10 o'clock A. M., at the South village in Hartford. Although the notice of this anniversary is excluded from all our county papers except one, yet I rejoice that you have given notice of all the others in your paper. Br. Baldwin thought proper to pass by this anniversary, having his eye intent on the colonization meeting; and then, as if something needed proping, adds a letter by way of apology, and attempts a reconciliation between belligerent parties. We trust we shall not be deemed uncharitable, if like a true Yankee we shrewdly guess the object of that conciliatory letter was to get people to attend the colonization meeting. Very well, this is all right. If Br. Baldwin wishes to pronounce a eulogy over the carcass of the dead Lion, he will see some honest friends of the black man there to shed the tear of condolence with him; and all we ask in return is that Br. B. and all who think with him, will attend the Anti-Slavery meeting and hear and judge. True, Br. B. did not want our anniversary held at his church, for fear of "getting up an excitement;" but we trust his fears will prove groundless. An excitement seems to terrify the good brother. If a rum-seller, on being reasoned with, should get mad and threaten to dissolve the Union; Br. B. would of course "strive for the things which make for peace," lest the rum-seller should get up an excitement, and make a noise in community!

But we say "no, to them that cry peace, peace, where the Lord has not spoken peace; who sew pillows to arm-holes, and bolster up the [Southern] people in iniquity."

We should rejoice to see any of our Vermont friends at the anniversary.

Yours truly,

E. D. CULVER.

Fort-Ann, Jan. 17, 1836.

From a correspondent in Middlebury.

We had an excellent meeting at Vergennes. No disturbance, and well attended by the substantial farmers around.—Addresses were given in the afternoon by Dr. Allen, Mr. Johnson, and E. D. Barber Esq.; and in the evening by Rev. Mr. Eaton of Charlotte. The grounds taken were, that the Anti-Slavery Society commends itself to the public, equally with the Am. Foreign Missionary Society, the Am. Bible Society, or any other benevolent society of the day—hence it becomes an object of immense interest to Christians. The arguments adduced to sustain these positions were unanswerable. Mr. Eaton's address I did not hear; but it is said, by competent judges, to have been a splendid production.

LAKE GEORGE ASSOCIATION.—Minutes just received. Its nineteenth annual session was held at Minerva, September 2d and 3d. Levi Scofield, moderator—Alvin Barton, clerk. In this Association there are 13 churches; 4 ordained ministers and 3 licentiates. Total number of communicants, 1006. Additions by baptism, during the year, 41. Next session to be held at Queensbury, 1st Wednesday in September, 1836. Introductory sermon on that occasion by Rev. Joseph

B. Wilkins. The following are among the resolutions passed:

Resolved. That in view of the efforts now making for the final and triumphant success of the temperance reformation by the American Temperance Society in excluding all inebriating drinks as a common beverage, that we recommend to the messengers and churches composing this association to exclude as a beverage all intoxicating drinks. Agreed to, not only by all the ministers, deacons, and delegates, but, by almost all the assembly.

Resolved. That we recommend to all our brethren in this association to patronize and encourage the N. Y. Baptist Register and the Vermont Telegraph.

Resolved. That in view of the destitute condition of many parts of our own State and Pennsylvania which the convention has undertaken to supply; and the state of many destitute places of the valley of the Mississippi and all North America, spreading as it is with Roman Catholicism, and all manner of errors, to which territory the American Baptist Home mission society is sending out missionaries by the aid of funds raised by the convention, we earnestly recommend to the churches of this association to raise at least \$100 for the convention of the state the ensuing year.

Resolved. That we view slavery as now existing in these United States to be repugnant to the law of God, and the spirit of our national charter which recognizes the right of all men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and the best and dearest interest of man; Therefore, **Resolved.** That we will hold no communing fellowship with slave-holding churches or individuals—agreed to without a dissenting voice by the delegates; and by request almost every person in the house manifested their approbation of the resolution by rising.

From the New-York Times.

SPECIAL MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

GENTLEMEN,—In my Message at the opening of your session, I informed you, that our Charge d'Affaires at Paris had been instructed to ask for the final determination of the French Government, in relation to the payment of the indemnification, secured by the treaty of the 4th of July, 1831, and that when advice on the result should be received, it would be made the subject of a special communication.

In execution of this design, I now transmit to you the papers numbered from 1 to 13, inclusive, containing, among other things, the correspondence on this subject between our Charge d'Affaires and the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, from which it will be seen, that France requires, as a condition precedent to the execution of a treaty unconditionally ratified, and to the payment of a debt acknowledged by all the branches of her Government to be due, that certain explanations shall be made, of which she dictates the terms. These terms are such as informed cannot be complied with; and, if persisted in, they must be considered as a deliberate refusal on the part of France to fulfill engagements binding by the laws of nations, and held sacred by the whole civilized world. The nature of the act which France requires from this Government, is clearly set forth in the letter of the French Minister, marked No. 4. "We will pay the money," says he, "when the Government of the United States is ready, on its part, to declare to us, by addressing its claim to officially, in writing, that it regrets the misunderstanding which has arisen between the two countries; that this misunderstanding is founded on a mistake; that it never entered into its intention to call in question the good faith of the French Government, nor to take a menacing attitude towards France;" and he adds, "if the Government of the United States does not give this assurance, we shall be obliged to think that this misunderstanding is not the result of an error." In the letter marked No. 6, the French Minister also remarks, "that the Government of the United States knows, that upon itself depends henceforward the execution of the treaty of July 4th, 1831."

Obliged by the precise language thus used by the French Minister, to view it as a peremptory refusal to execute the treaty, except on terms incompatible with the honor and independence of the United States, and persuaded, that on considering the correspondence now submitted to you, you can regard it in no other light, it becomes my duty to call your attention to such measures as the exigency of the case demands, if the claim of interfering in the communications between the different branches of our government shall be persisted in. This pretension is rendered the more unreasonable by the fact, that the substance of the required explanation has been repeatedly and voluntarily given before it was insisted on as a condition—a condition the more humiliating, because it is demanded as the equivalent of a pecuniary consideration. Does France desire only a declaration that we had no intention to obtain our rights by an address to her fears rather than to her justice? She has already had it, frankly and explicitly given by our Minister, accredited to her Government, his act ratified by me, and my confirmation of it officially communicated by him, in his letter to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, of the 25th of April, 1835, and repeated by my published approval of that letter after the passage of the bill of indemnification. Does France want a degrading, servile repetition of this act, in terms which she shall dictate, and which will involve an acknowledgement of her assumed right to interfere in our domestic concerns? She will never obtain it. The spirit of the American people, the dignity of the Legislature, and the firm resolve of their Executive Government, forbid it.

As the answer of the French Minister to our Charge d'Affaires at Paris, contains an allusion to a letter addressed by him to the representative of France at this place, it now becomes proper to lay before you the correspondence had between that functionary and the Secretary of State relative to that letter, and to accompany the same with such explanations as will enable you to understand the course of the executive in relation to it. Recurring to the historical statement made at the commencement of your session, of the

origin and progress of our difficulties with France, it will be recollected that, on the return of our Minister to the United States, I caused my official approval of the explanations he had given to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, to be made public. As the French Government had noticed the Message without its being officially communicated, it was not doubted that, if they were disposed to pay the money due to us, they would notice any public explanation of the Government of the United States in the same way. But, contrary to these well founded expectations, the French Ministry did not take this fair opportunity to relieve themselves from their unfortunate position, and to do justice to the United States.

Whilst, however, the Government of the United States was awaiting the movements of the French Government, in perfect confidence that the difficulty was at an end, the Secretary of War received a call from the French Charge d'Affaires in Washington, who desired to read to him a letter he had received from the French Minister of Foreign Affairs. He was asked whether he was instructed or directed to make any official communication, and replied that he was only authorized to read the letter and furnish a copy if requested. The substance of its contents, it is presumed, may be gathered from Nos. 4 and 6, herewith transmitted. It was an attempt to make known to the Government of the United States, privately, in what manner it would make explanations, apparently voluntary, but really dictated by France, acceptable to her, and thus obtain payment of the twenty-five millions of francs. No exception was taken to this mode of communication, which is often used to prepare the way for official intercourse, but the suggestions made in it were in their substance, wholly inadmissible. Not being in the shape of an official communication to the Government, it did not admit of reply or official notice, nor could it safely be made the basis of any action by the Executive or the Legislature; and the Secretary of State did not think proper to ask a copy, because he could have no use for it.

Copies of papers marked numbers 9, 10 & 11, show an attempt on the part of the French Charge d'Affaires, many weeks afterwards, to place a copy of this paper among the archives of this Government, which for obvious reasons was not allowed to be done; but the assurance before given was repeated, that any official communication which might be authorized to make in the accustomed form, would receive a prompt and just consideration. This indiscretion of the attempt was made more manifest by the subsequent avowal of the French Charge d'Affaires that the object was to bring this letter before Congress and the American people. If foreign agents, on a subject of disagreement between their Government and this, wish to prefer an appeal to the American people, they will hereafter, it is hoped, better appreciate their own rights, and the respect due to others, than to attempt to use the Executive as the passive organ of their communications.

It is due to the character of our institutions, that the diplomatic intercourse of the Government should be conducted with the utmost directness and simplicity, and that in cases of importance, the communications received or made by the Executive, should assume the accustomed official form. It is only by insisting on this form, that foreign powers can be held to full responsibility, that their communications can be officially replied to; or that the advice or interference of the Legislature can, with propriety, be invited by the President. This course is also the best calculated, on the one hand, to shield the officer from unjust suspicions, & on the other, to subject this portion of his acts to public scrutiny; & if occasion should require it, to constitutional animadversion. It was the more necessary to adhere to these principles in the instance in question, inasmuch as, in addition to other important interests, it very intimately concerned the national honor; a matter in my judgment, much too sacred to be made the subject of private and unofficial negotiation.

It will be perceived that this letter of the French Minister of Foreign Affairs was read to the Secretary of State on the 11th of September last. This was the first authentic information of the specific views of the French Government, received by the Government of the United States after the passage of the bill of indemnification. Inasmuch as the letter had been written before the official notice of my approval of Mr. Livingston's last explanation and remonstrance could have reached Paris, just ground of hope was left, as has been before stated, that the French Government, on receiving this information, in the same manner the alleged offending message had reached them, would desist from their extraordinary demand, and pay the money at once. To give them an opportunity to do so, and, at all events, to elicit their final determination, & the ground they intended to occupy, the instructions were given to our Charge d'Affaires, which were adverted to at the commencement of the present session of Congress. The result, as you have seen, is a demand of an official written expression of regret, and a direct explanation addressed to France, with a distinct intimation that this is a *sine qua non*.

Mr. Barton having, in pursuance of his instructions, returned to the United States, & the Charge d'Affaires of France having been recalled, all diplomatic intercourse between the two countries is suspended—a state of things originating in an unreasonable susceptibility on the part of the French Government, and rendered necessary on our part, their refusal to perform engagements contained in a treaty, from the faithful performance of which by us they are to this day enjoying many important commercial advantages.

It is time that this unequal position of affairs should cease, and that legislative action should be brought to sustain Executive exertion in such measures as the case requires. While France persists in her refusal to comply with the terms of a treaty, the object of which was, by removing all causes of mutual complaints, to renew ancient feelings of friendship, and to unite the two nations in the bonds of amity, and of a mutually beneficial commerce, she cannot justly complain if we adopt such peaceful remedies as the law of nations and the circumstances of the case may authorize and demand. Of the nature of these remedies, I have heretofore had occasion to speak, and in reference to a particular contingency, to express my conviction that reprisals would be best adapted to the emergency then contemplated. Since that period, France, by all the departments of her Government, has acknowledged the validity of our claims, and the obligations of this treaty, and has appropriated the moneys which are necessary to its execution; & though payment is withheld on grounds vitally important to our existence as an independent nation, it is not to be believed that